

REMARKS

For the convenience of the Examiner, this Reply is organized under appropriate subheadings.

Amendment to Claim 5 and New Claims 15-18

Support for the amendment to Claim 5 and new Claims 15-18 can be found in throughout the specification. For example, page 31, lines 6-9, describe primary and secondary glomerulonephritis diseases, thereby providing support for the amendment to Claim 5. Support for new Claims 15-17 can be found at page 31, lines 6-9; Table 1, page 37; Table 2, page 38; and Table 3, page 39 which describe membranous nephropathy, focal segmental glomerulosclerosis, IgA nephropathy, membranoproliferative glomerulonephritis, crescentic glomerulonephritis, systemic lupus erythematosus, henoch-schonlein purpura, hemolytic uremic syndrome and ischemic nephropathy. Page 18, lines 17-20 describes progression of a kidney disease to include damage to an interstitium of a kidney thereby providing support for new Claim 18.

No new matter has been added to the amendment to Claim 5 and to new Claims 15-18. Entry is requested.

Statement of Substance of the Interview

An Interview Summary, mailed from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on November 30, 2004, provided Examiner Winston's summary of the in-person interview conducted on November 17, 2004 between Examiner Winston, Sudhir V. Shah, M.D., the Applicant, and N. Scott Pierce and Mary K. Murray, Ph.D., Applicant's Attorneys. Applicant's Attorney notes that the date of the interview is mistakenly identified in the Interview Summary as November 16, 2004.

The substance of the interview concerned a Reply, filed November 1, 2004, in response to an Office Action mailed June 3, 2004. All of the pending claims were discussed. Examiner Winston, Applicant and Applicant's Attorneys discussed the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, § 102(b) and § 103. The Examiner agreed with the Applicant that U.S. Patent No: 4,684,482, issued to Green, D.E. (hereinafter "Green") did not anticipate Applicant's

claimed invention. Examiner Winston, Applicant and Applicant's Attorneys also discussed the remaining references cited in the Office Action. Applicant and Applicant's Attorneys discussed how Applicant's claimed invention is novel and non-obvious in view of Green and the remaining references cited in the Office Action.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims under consideration.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to call Applicant's undersigned Attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Mary K. Murray
Mary K. Murray
Registration No. 47,813
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: December 30, 2004